

# Further Investigations into San Francisco Estuary White Sturgeon (*Acipenser transmontanus*) Year-Class Strength

Marty Gingras, Jason DuBois, and Max Fish

Marty.Gingras@wildlife.ca.gov

## Introduction

Successful management of White Sturgeon, its fishery, and its habitat requires a time series of recruitment. Indices of White Sturgeon year-class strength from observations of very young fish avoid most of the inaccuracies and expenses associated with assignment of ages to older fish through examination of hard parts and provide upwards of 10 years advance notice of recruitment to the fishery. Fish (2010) reported the relation between Delta outflow and a year-class index ( $YCI_{BS}$ ) from catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) of age-0 and age-1 White Sturgeon collected systematically by the San Francisco Bay Study's otter trawl from throughout much of the area young White Sturgeon occur, and suggested that the metric was of more utility than preceding indices and certain categories of alternative indices. Here we describe a brief investigation intended to help understand  $YCI_{BS}$  and some other potential White Sturgeon year-class strength indices.

## Methods

We contrasted  $YCI_{BS}$  with a possible index ( $YCI_{Ep}$ ; as in Counihan et al. 1999) from collection of White Sturgeon by Bay Study otter trawl and with a possible index derived from the estimated salvage of White Sturgeon entrained at the State Water Project (SWP) Skinner Fish Protective Facility ( $WST_{SAL}$ ) in the South Delta. We also investigated possible indices from catch of White Sturgeon reported by the recreational anglers who submitted Sturgeon Fishing Report Cards and catch by the Department using experimental setlines (DuBois et al. 2010), but — largely because those time series are so brief — we found them to be of little use and won't describe those efforts here.

$YCI_{BS}$  is a measure of White Sturgeon CPUE from Bay Study otter trawl data, whereas  $E_p$  is the annual percentage of Bay Study otter trawls in which age-0 or age-1 White Sturgeon were collected.  $YCI_{Ep}$  is the annual index based on  $E_p$ , is calculated using the original 35 stations, and is the sum of the percentage of total otter trawl tows which contained at least one age-0 White Sturgeon (April-October) and the percentage of total otter trawl tows which contained at least one age-1 White Sturgeon (February-October) lagged by one year, similar to the  $YCI_{BS}$ :

$$YCI_{Ep} = [E_p(\text{Apr} - \text{Oct})]_t + [E_p(\text{Feb} - \text{Oct})]_{t-1}$$

Use of estimated salvage to index White Sturgeon year-class strength was tempting because the estimates vary substantially year to year and it seems that more young White Sturgeon are salvaged than are documented anywhere else in the system. Estimated salvage at the SWP is an extrapolation from the number of fish collected during exports and — due in large part to variations in sampling effort and efficiency — is not itself a plausible index of White Sturgeon year-class strength.  $WST_{SAL}$  is White Sturgeon density at the SWP from estimated salvage relative to the volume of water exported, and is more likely to vary in proportion to White Sturgeon year-class strength than estimated salvage.  $WST_{SAL}$  is calculated using the formula below:

$$WST_{SAL} = \sum_{\text{May} - \text{December}} \left( \left[ \frac{\sum_m \text{Salvage}}{(\sum_m \text{Acre Feet}) \times 1233.48} \right] \times 10,000 \right)$$

where:

Salvage	= expanded salvage of White Sturgeon
Acre Feet	= volume of water pumped
m	= individual month (May through December only)
1233.48	= factor to convert acre feet to cubic meters
10,000	= factor to convert density to per 10,000 cubic meters

Although White Sturgeon larvae and juveniles are salvaged at the SWP, estimates of White Sturgeon salvage — and thus salvage density — are not stratified by fish length or age. In an effort to assure that  $WST_{SAL}$  represents White Sturgeon production each year rather than production over the course of more than one year, annual  $WST_{SAL}$  values only include densities for the May-December period when age-0 White Sturgeon were likely the dominant age-class salvaged.

The contrasts we describe here are from comparing plots of  $WST_{SAL}$ ,  $YCI_{BS}$ , and  $E_P$  as time series and from regression (R statistical software Version 2.15.2, 2012), coefficient of determination (as  $R^2$ ), and p-value.

## Results

Trends in  $YCI_{BS}$  and  $YCI_{EP}$  are nearly identical (Figure 1; Table 1) and the relationship is strongly linear (Figure 2; test for zero slope:  $F = 419.2$ ;  $DF = 1,30$ ;  $p = 2.2e-16$ ). With few exceptions juvenile sturgeon only appeared relatively abundant as well as broadly distributed in years classified as wet.

Trends in  $YCI_{BS}$  and  $WST_{SAL}$  share some attributes — e.g., record-high numbers of White Sturgeon in the same years; long periods when few if any young White Sturgeon were observed (Figure 3; Table 1) — but the relationship cannot be reasonably described by a simple model. A linear fit resulted only because both variables were exceptionally high in 1982 and 1983 (Figure 4; test for zero slope:  $F = 30.12$ ;  $DF = 1,30$ ;  $p = 5.87e-06$ ), and in absence of values from 1982 and 1983 there are hints of a weak

inverse relationship. As with  $YCI_{BS}$  and  $YCI_{Ep}$ , with few exceptions juvenile sturgeon only appeared relatively abundant in years classified as wet.

## Discussion

Although both were calculated using the same Bay Study survey data, the correlation between  $YCI_{BS}$  and  $YCI_{Ep}$  was not inevitable and suggests that observed White Sturgeon patchiness did not necessarily affect the accuracy of either. We consider the measures complementary rather than alternatives, because future White Sturgeon patchiness could affect either or both.

Use of  $WST_{SAL}$  to index White Sturgeon year-class strength would be inherently suspect due to variations in sampling effort and because most young White Sturgeon — by virtue of the distribution of adults during spawning (see DuBois et al. 2010) — likely moved along the bottom (Kynard and Parker 2005) down the Sacramento River rather than into the south Delta (as in Stevens and Miller 1970) where they might be salvaged. Thus and given that annual trends in  $YCI_{BS}$  (and the closely-related  $YCI_{Ep}$ ) and  $WST_{SAL}$  are only coarsely similar, we do not consider  $WST_{SAL}$  an index of White Sturgeon year-class strength but do consider it complementary to  $YCI_{BS}$  and  $YCI_{Ep}$ .

Having explored potential year-class indices from the pertinent surveys we are aware of, we plan to gain additional insight into  $YCI_{BS}$  and  $YCI_{Ep}$  — and sturgeon year-class strength in general — by mining data that speaks to the phenology of sturgeon spawning and age-0 recruitment to the Delta and bays of the San Francisco Estuary. Our hope is that we will reduce uncertainty about sturgeon year-class strength and learn more about environmental factors affecting sturgeon year-class strength (as in Coutant 2004, Fish 2010, Mayfield and Cech 2004, and McAdam et al. 2005).

Management Note: UC Davis and commercial aquaculture facilities produced and released White Sturgeon fry and fingerlings from 1980-1988 as mitigation for collection of broodstock, but survival of the stocked fish was not evaluated. Although we have not yet found detailed records of the dates, locations, sizes, or numbers of released fish, we have recently learned that UC Davis released roughly 200,000 fingerlings in the spring of 1982 (Monaco 1983) and UC Davis was reported to have released a total of 500,000 fish by 1986 (Steinhart 1986). We are looking into whether or not it is plausible that record-high 1982 and 1983 White Sturgeon  $YCI_{BS}$ ,  $YCI_{Ep}$ , and  $WST_{SAL}$  values were notably affected by stocked fish.

## References

Baxter, R., K. Hieb, S. DeLeón, K. Fleming, and J. Orsi. 1999. Report on the 1980-1995 fish, shrimp, and crab sampling in the San Francisco Estuary, California. J. Orsi, editor. Interagency Ecological Program Technical Report 63, 503 pp.

Counihan, T.D., A.I. Miller, and M.J. Parsley. 1999. Indexing the relative abundance of age-0 white sturgeons in an impoundment of the lower Columbia River from highly skewed trawling data. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 19:520-529.

Coutant, C.C. 2004. A riparian habitat hypothesis for successful reproduction of white sturgeon. *Reviews in Fisheries Science* 12:23-73.

DuBois, J., E. Gleason, and M. Gingras. 2010. Review of Juvenile Sturgeon Setline Survey. *Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Estuary Newsletter* 23 (3).

DuBois, J., T. Matt, and B. Beckett. 2010. 2009 Sturgeon Fishing Report Card: Preliminary Data Report. California Department of Fish and Game, Stockton, California.

Fish, M.A. 2010. A white sturgeon year-class index for the San Francisco Estuary and its relation to delta outflow. *Interagency Ecological Program for the San Francisco Estuary Newsletter* 23(2).

Kynard, B., and E. Parker. 2005. Ontogenetic behavior and dispersal of Sacramento River white sturgeon, *Acipenser transmontanus*, with a note on body color. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 71: 145–156.

Mayfield, R. B. and J. J. Cech. 2004. Temperature effects on green sturgeon bioenergetics. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 133:961-970.

McAdam, S.O., C.J. Walters, and C. Nistor. 2005. Linkages between white sturgeon recruitment and altered bed substrates in the Nechako River, Canada. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 134 (6): 1448-1456.

Monaco, G. 1983. A general description of sturgeon aquaculture currently being conducted at the University of California at Davis. *Cal-Neva Wildlife Transactions*.

R Development Core Team (2012). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0, URL <http://www.R-project.org>.

Steinhart, P. 1986. The caviar connection. *National Wildlife*. December/January.

Stevens, D.E. and L.W. Miller. 1970. Distribution of sturgeon larvae in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River system. *California Fish and Game* 56:2 80-86.

Table 1 Annual White Sturgeon indices from Bay Study ( $YCI_{BS}$  and  $YCI_{EP}$ ) and estimated salvage density ( $WST_{SAL}$ ); water-year type included for reader's reference, for further details refer to M. Fish (2010)

Figure 1 Time series of  $YCI_{BS}$  and  $YCI_{EP}$

Figure 2 Scatter plot and linear regression of  $YCI_{EP}$  versus  $YCI_{BS}$

Figure 3 Time series of  $YCI_{BS}$  and  $WST_{SAL}$

Figure 4 Scatter plot and linear regression of  $WST_{SAL}$  versus  $YCI_{BS}$

Year	Water Year <sup>a</sup>	YCI <sub>BS</sub>	YCI <sub>EP</sub>	WST <sub>SAL</sub>
1980	AN	11.076	0.004	1.373
1981	D	21.848	0.010	0.330
1982	W	719.697	0.102	1.760
1983	W	599.637	0.128	3.425
1984	W	40.657	0.016	0.526
1985	D	44.039	0.014	0.225
1986	W	23.503	0.010	0.548
1987	D	8.466	0.003	0.075
1988	C	-	-	-
1989	D	-	-	-
1990	C	-	-	-
1991	C	-	-	-
1992	C	-	-	-
1993	AN	72.494	0.015	0.013
1994	C	-	-	-
1995	W	348.611	0.048	0.042
1996	W	160.999	0.025	0.069
1997	W	46.733	0.010	0.034
1998	W	327.740	0.039	0.109
1999	W	18.190	0.007	0.023
2000	AN	-	-	0.011
2001	D	-	-	0.027
2002	D	-	-	0.057
2003	AN	-	-	-
2004	BN	19.131	0.004	-
2005	BN	-	-	-
2006	W	234.599	0.050	0.010
2007	D	30.192	0.011	0.018
2008	C	-	-	0.022
2009	D	-	-	0.005
2010	BN	-	-	-
2011	W	48.806	0.008	0.003

<sup>a</sup> AN = above normal, BN = below normal, C = critical,  
D = dry, W = wet









